We therefore make no recommendations in regard to the present Bill, but recommend that Government may bring forward separate Bill or Bills to provide for the matters referred to above."

In these circumstances the Select Committee was very well advised in making the recommendation and I hope this will commend itself to this House.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ (ಶ್ರೀರಂಗಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಇದೇ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದು ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಾಗಿ, ವರದಿಯು ಕೂಡ ಬಂದು ಕಾರಣಾಂತರದಿಂದ ಅದು ಮುಂದು ವರಿಯದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ನಿಂತಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಏನು ವರದಿ ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆಂಬುದು ನವುಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಬೇಕು.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I think it had come up before, I remember, and perhaps, owing to the prorogation of the Session it lapsed and therefore it had to be taken up afresh. It was taken up again for discussion in this House and it was referred to the Select Committee when all these relevant matters were considered.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ನಮ್ಮ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ, ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದ ಯಾವ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಬಂದರೂ ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಡಿಸ್ಪಿ ಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ (ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ) ಮನೂದೆ, ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರಿ ರದ್ದಿಯಾತಿ ಮನೂದೆ-ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದೇ ಮುಂದು ವರಿಯುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯವರು ಸಹ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಿ ವರದಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ವರದಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A copy of it must be in our library.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದೂ ಸಹ ಇನ್ನೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಯಾಗುವುದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅಧಿವೇಶನ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗುವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ amendments ಬರುವುದು, ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಕರಾರುಗಳಾಗುವುದು, ಅವು ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗದೇ ಪುನಃ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದು-ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗುತ್ತ, ಹೋದರೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಂದಿಗೆ ಮೋಕ್ಷ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದು? ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಕ್ರಮ ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ, ಒಂದು ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರುವ ಮುನ್ನ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಿ, ಅಲ್ಲಗೂ ಚರ್ಚಾಸ್ಪದವಾದುದಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ವಿವೇಚನೆಗೆ ಒಳಪಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲಾದರೂ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಶಾಸನಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದು ಕಾನೂನು ಕಡತಕ್ಕೇರಿಸುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Even the Sanitary Board Bill fell through.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Yes. That is also another instance. ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಾದರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Once again I may point out that the Select Committee consisted of labour leaders, Opposition Members and also a few of the Government benches. I will read the names of the members for edification of the Hon'ble Member.

Myself as Chairman, Sri T. Channiah, Sri K. Pattabhiraman, Sri R. Anantaraman, Sri P. Swamidurai, Sri A. Bheemappa Naik, Sri S. Srinivasa Iyengar and Sri K. S. Vasan. So it is a unanimous report.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—We did not say that it is wrong for them to have made that recommendation.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—We did not find fault with the members of the Committee. On the other hand we admire their pluck and courage. But the initial responsibility lies with the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That leave be granted to withdraw the Mysore Kolar Gold fields Municipal Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION REGULATION (LIMITATION OF FUNCTIONS), 1953.

Motion to consider Modifications made in the Council.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue and Public Works).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the following modifications made to the Mysore Public Service Commission Regulation (Limitation of Functions), 1953, by the Legislative Council be adopted:

1. In the annexure under Subordinate Service for the existing note, the following note shall be substituted:

'The Director of Industries and Commerce is authorised to appoint

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)

in consultation with the Government the following staff in the Ministerial cadre for a period not exceeding one year.'

2. In the annexure under Subordinate Service in line No. 5 after the words 'Bus Drivers', the words 'Conductors and Cleaners in Government Service ' be added.'

These are the Rules made under article 320 of the Constitution. But in view of the amendments accepted by the Upper House, it is sufficient for me to move that only the Rules as amended by the Upper House may be taken into consideration.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I raise to a point of order, Sir. Whether it is the proper procedure, when a Bill in a certain form has been introduced.....

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—These are Regulations, not a Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I understand your point. Before we take up the consideration of the amendments to the Mysore Public Service Commission Regulation (Limitation of Functions), 1953, I would like to indicate briefly the procedure prescribed by the Constitution. According to article 320 (5) of the Constitution, regulations made under the proviso to clause (3) of the article have to be laid for not less than 14 days before each House of Legislature as soon as possible after they are made and they have to be subject to such modifications whether by way of repeal or amendment as both Houses may make during the Session in which they are so laid. The procedure envisaged is, therefore, firstly that as soon as rules are made, they have to be laid on the table of each House, secondly they have to be so laid for a period of 14 days and thirdly if any modifications are made by both Houses during the Session, the Regulations will become subject to such modifications. This indicates that the regulations take effect as soon as they are made and published and the regulations will be subject to modifications, if any, made by both Houses as soon as the modifications are so made by the two Houses. This kind of Parliamentary control, is, what is called, the negative type as distinguished from the affirmative type, according to which the Regulations will take effect only if expressly approved by both the Houses. In this type of control the discussion in the House is not in respect of the entire body of regulations but only in respect of those modifications of which notice has been given by Members. So far as the period during which legislative control is exercisable is concerned, according to clause (5) of article 320, the period of notice for moving any modifications would be 14 days during which these Regulations are required to be laid on the table.

The next question that arises for consideration is, as to how this period of 14 days has to be computed. In England under the Statutory Instruments Act, 1946, under which the number of days during which a negative resolution could be moved has been standardised at 40 days ; this period of 40 days is reckoned by taking no account of any time during which Parliament is dissolved or prorogued or during which both the Houses are adjourned for more than four days. So far as we are concerned, there is no such prescribed procedure. Adopting therefore a reasonable construction of clause (5) of article 320, I have come to the conclusion that this period of 14 days has to be reckoned from the day on which regulations are laid on the Table, but excluding any long adjournments like what we had between the 11th of April and the 13th of July. As is usual in reckoning such periods, we have to exclude the day on which the regulations were actually laid. On this computation, 14 days would expire on the 14th of July. Amendments tabled by Sri M. Chicklingiah, Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda and Sri B. N. Boranna Gowda would, therefore be in time There are a few amendments of which notice has been given by Sri B. Hutche Gowda on the 3rd August. According to the ruling that I have just now given, they are inadmissible.

Sri S. Srinivasa Iyengar and Sri M. Chikkalingiah have also tabled motions for referring the entire body of the Regulations to Select Committees.

As I indicated already, the procedure prescribed by clause (5) of article 320 of the Constitution, is of the negative type and as such it is not that the entire body of the regulations come within the purview of the Assembly for debate but only modifications of which due notice has been given by Members in time. Such being the case, there can be no reference to a Select Committee and those notices are, therefore, not in order. Finally since any modifications made by one House have to be also approved by the other House before they become effective under clause (5) of article 320, the two amendments which have been passed in the Legislative Council have come up for consideration in this House also and they will be taken up first.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.--Sir, Article 320 of the Constitution says what the functions of the Public Service Commission are in general. Clause (3) of the same Article deals with the matters in which the Public Service Commission shall be consulted. In the proviso to clause (3) it is provided that the Rajpramukh may make regulations specifying the matters in which either generally, or in any particular class of case or in any particular circumstances, it shall not be necessary for the Public Service Commission to be consulted. These Regulations are made under these provisions. It is relevant to add here that under the Constitution specific provisions are made regarding the appointments in the Secretariat of the Legislature, Public Service Commission and in the High Court. So these appointments are naturally beyond the purview of the Public Service Commission. Regarding other appointments...

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Minister need not make any general statement. He need speak only about the amendments. That will do. We will have to confine ourselves to these two amendments first.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Copies of those amendments may be given to us—those amendments which were passed in the Upper House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—They are already distributed. The Hon'ble Minister may speak on the amendments if it is absolutely necessary.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—The amendments are very simple. In the annexure it is mentioned that the Director of Industries and Commerce is authorised to appoint the following staff in the ministerial cadre for a period not exceeding one year without consulting the Public Service Commission. The amendment seeks to authorise the Director of Industries and Commerce to make the appointment in consultation with the Government.

The next amendment deals with the appointment of bus drivers, conductors and cleaners in Government service. This amendment proposes to empower the Government to appoint the Conductors and Cleaners and Bus Drivers without consulting the Public Service Commission. These are very simple amendments.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the following modifications made to the Mysore Public Service Commission Regulation (Limitation of Functions), 1953, by the Legislative Council be adopted:

1. In the annexure under Subordinate Service for the existing note, the following note shall be substituted:

'The Director of Industries and Commerce is authorised to appoint in consultation with the Government the following staff in the Ministerial Cadre for a period not exceeding one year.'

2. In the annexure under Subordinate Service in line No. 5 after the words 'Bus Drivers', the words 'Conductors and Cleaners in Government Service' be added."

***Sri P. R. RAMAIYA** (Basavangudi).--With regard to the report of the Public Service Commission, there are two points which deserve the attention of the Government. First of all, it is true that provision has been made for holding competitive exminations. These competitive examinations were held years ago and for some reason or other, these examinations have been suspended and

(Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.)

we do not know the programme of Government in this matter. For All-India Service, these competitive examinations are being held year by year, but in Mysore where a good tradition has been established in this matter, somehow that practice is not being observed now. I would urge upon the Government the necessity of improving.....

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Holalkere).—I rise to a point of order. Are you allowing any debate on the amendments or on the report of the Public Service Commission?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Just wait and see. There is no point of order.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—I am speaking with reference to the amendment. The amendment is very comprehensive and gives scope for making some suggestions on this occasion. A good tradition was being followed by this Government in holding competitive examinations and the quality of service was very high, and I do not know what reasons have impelled the Government to give up that practice now. I would urge the Government to see the necessity of holding these examinations with a view to make the services more efficient and also.....

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Is the amendment under discussion?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Only the amendment.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—From the point of view of economy also, where five people are serving, we can have two people serving more efficiently. In these days of economy it is very necessary that we make Government service more efficient and competent.

The other point is with regard to the promotions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given my ruling after taking into account Article 320, particularly clauses 3 and 5. We will have to confine ourselves to the amendments now moved.

***Sri M. LINGANNA** (Nanjangud).—With your permission, I want to make this submission. So far as the order of the Chair is concerned, there are no two opinions. I wish to draw the attention of the Chair to one aspect of this particular question, because I do not know whether we are simply taking into consideration the rules and regulations made by the Public Service Commission and also by the Government or merely the amendments along with the report given by the Public Service Commission, in which case the report of the Public Service Commissisn is to be considered. Then I believe we are attracting Article 323(2) and I do not know whether we can also offer our remarks so far as the report is concerned. In that case, we are not given a ruling as to whether we can separately deal with that report and also whether we can deal with the particular amendments in relation to the rules and regulations made thereunder. In such a case, I would request the Chair to guide the House so far as that aspect of the question is concerned.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—I have got one more point. With regard to the promotions in the Subordinate Service, whatever may be the rules that are framed, when once the persons are recruited and they have been serving carefully, their due must be respected and they should be given proper promotions and no juniors should be made to supersede seniors in service.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—A ruling is given that the debate should be on the amendments.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA.—Specially in the University, this grievance has been.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given my ruling. If you want to discuss these matters, you ought to have given notice of amendments or modifications. We will have to confine ourselves to these amendments.

Sri N. C. NAGAIAH REDDY (Goribidnur).—Before a ruling comes in, he has already made his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Just as the other day Hon'ble Member Sri Nagaiah Reddy passed some remarks about something. (*Laughter.*) Any other member to speak about these amendments?

1-30 P.M.

***Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.**—I oppose these amendmets.

"The Diretor of Industrsies rnd Commerce is authorisrd to appoint

in consultation with the Government the following staff in the Ministerial Cadre for a period not exceeding one year."

ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನನ್ನು consult ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿರಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ 320 (3) (a) ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ"

" The Union Public Service Commission or the State Public Service Commission, as the case may be, *shall be consulted :* (a) on all matters relating to methods of recruitment to civil services and for civil posts ;"

ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಿರಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷವಾಗಲಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಹಂಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಿಂದ ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೇ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾವಾಗ ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ನೌಕರಿಗೆ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ 320ನೆಯ ವಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ 'shall be consulted' ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಒಂದು ರೆಗ್ಯುಲೇಷನ್‌ನಿಂದ ತಪ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಪರಿಶಿಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಾಗಿರುವ ಡ್ರೈವರುಗಳು, ಕ್ಲೀನರುಗಳು ಮುಂತಾದವರನ್ನು ಹಂಗಾಮಿಯಾಗಿ ಮೂರುತಿಂಗಳೊಳಗೆ ನೇಮಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಯಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು, ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್‌ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ ಕಮಿಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಕೇಳದೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೇ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—To the point raised by Sri Hutche Gowda, I wish to say that Article 320, subclause (3) (a) is governed by the provision. So there is no constitutional repugnance for this amendment. According to the amendment, the Director of Indutries can appoint with the approval of the Government the Chief Accountant, the Sales Officers, Labour Welfare Officers, Accountants, Ledger Keepers, Store Keepers and Cashiers. Only in the case of these six appointments, he is empowered to appoint for a period not exceeding one year. These are mostly technical matters and the Director of Industries has to appoint only in cases of emergency without consulting the Public Service Commission. Consulting the Public Service Commission means considerable delay and therefore to obviate this difficulty, it is proposed that he may be empowered to appoint for a period not exceeding one year these several officers.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—I am against this amendment. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ನೇಚರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಚೀಫ್ ಅಕೌಂಟೆಂಟ್, ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಆಫೀಸರ್ಸ್, ಅಕೌಂಟೆಂಟ್ಸ್, ಲೆಡ್ಜರ್‌ಕೀಪರ್ಸ್, ಸ್ಟೋರ್ ಕೀಪರ್ಸ್ ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೆಡ್‌ಕ್ಲರ್ಕ್ಸ್‌ಬಲ್ಲ್ಸ್, ದಫೇದಾರ್ಸ್, ಅಟೆಂಡರ್ಸ್, ಮುಚ್ಚಿಗ್ಗಿಸ್ ಇವುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕಾರಣದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇವಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೀಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಕೊಡುತ್ತಾಹೋದರೆ, ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷಕ್ಕೆಂದು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಅವರನ್ನೇ ಖಾಯಂಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಜಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಶಿಫಾರಸುಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಈ ನೌಕರಿಗಳು ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ಸ್ವಭಾವದವುಗಳಲ್ಲವಾದುದರಿಂದ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೇವಿರೋಧವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—I want one clarification from the Minister, Sir. For these temporary appointments, will the rules of recruitment be applied or will anybody who is favoured by the Director of Industries, or the Director desires to appoint be appointed ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Even for temporary appointments, the general rules of recruitment are followed. In cases of grave emergency and in exceptional cases, the Director of Industries is empowered to make appointments and that is only for a period of one year.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is the point to be clarified, Sri Mulka Govinda Reddy ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ.— Rules of recruitment ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಥವಾ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೊ ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Generally, rules of recruitment will be followed.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುಲ್ಕ ಗೋವಿಂದರೆಡ್ಡಿ.— ರಿಕ್ರೂಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಿದರೆ, the purpose will be served. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಯಾರನ್ನಾದರೂ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೇ ಅದಕ್ಕೇ whether rules of recruitment will be applied ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದೆ.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—How can it be applied when the Public Service Commission has all the records and how can the head of the department adhere to those principles ?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T. Narasipur).—Filling up the place of the Chief Accountant, will it be a place of emergency ? When the post of the Chief Accountant is a promotional posting how can it become a matter of emergency ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.-There may arise a case of emergency and to provide for that contingency, the Director is empowered.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Is not the post of the Chief Accountant a promotional one ? How can emergency appointment be made in the post of the Chief Accountant ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Suppose there is no man at all to be promoted ? To provide for such a contingency this amendment is provided.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Even in such cases, is it not necessary to see that the Public Service Commission interviews the applicant and scrutinises his qualifications etc. ?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA. — The Public Service Commission will have the opportunity of scrutinising the application and interviewing the applicant. But only in exceptional cases, where it is for less than a year, the Director will be empowered to make appointment.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—If it is a matter of a particular accountant becoming a Chief Accountant, the Public Service Commission might as well do it. Why should the Director of Industries be empowered to straight away make him the Chief Accountant ? Even for one year, he can as well remain the same officer.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA. — The Hon'ble Member is mistaken. The Director of Industries is not given the power to over-rule the claim of any other person who has to be promoted. Supposing there is no other man who can take that place. In such cases, the Director will be empowered to appoint for a period not exceeding one year. In cases where the question arises whether a man deserves to be promoted or not, the Public Service Commission has to be consulted.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—It is not stated here that the period is restricted to one year or that it is in the case of emergency.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is for a period not exceeding one year.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—It is not given in the note below, Sir. From 1 to 5, it is not stated.

Mr. SPEAKER,—1 to 7.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ನೋಡ್ರಿನೇಟ್ ನರ್ವಿನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಷಯ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಚೀಫ್ ಅಕೌಂಟೆಂಟ್ ಎನ್ನುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿದೆ. It is not even stated that it is in the case of emergency.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No. For that note, this amendment is to be substituted. The amendment is there. You can read it. That applies from 1 to 7 and not merely 1 to 5. For officers in sl. no. 1 to 7, a period not exceeding one year has been prescribed here.

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN (Chamarajpet).—To me, it appears not at all necessary, because, as you are aware, the Director has got power without consulting the Public Service Commission to make temporary appointments, under the Regulations, as in other Departments. Suppossing the Public Service Commission delays in appointing persons, then the concerned Head of the Department may appoint local candidates as well. He can thus go on for some time pending the appointment by the Public Service Commission.

Mr. SPEAKER.—How long can he go on ?

Sri R. ANANTARAMAN.—For not more than one year ; here also, according to the amendment, the Director can appoint for one year. When the Head of the Department has got this power himself, why should this provision be again made by way of an amendment here ? Straightaway he can appoint. There is, therefore, no necessity to curtail the power of the Public Service Commission.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—Instead of saying 'Government' in the amendment, if it is changed to 'with the approval of the Public Service Commission', I am agreeable.

Sri T. C. BASAPPA (Tarikere).—In these Regulations, Section 5 says :

"It shall not be necessary to consult the Commission in regard to filling up of posts borne on the cadre to which appointments have to be made after consulting the Commission, in the following cases :

(*a*) Temporary appointments of persons in short-term vacancies, the duration of which does not exceed six months ;

(*b*) local appointments for a maximum period of six months pending compliance with the service rules."

When that provision is there for appointing local candidates in temporary appointments for six months, I do not see the necessity of taking this power of appointing people without even consulting the Public Service Commission or even the Government.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.— The question before us is whether the present note in the Regulation has to be substituted by this proposed amendment. If no amendment had been tabled, the note would have continued in the Regulation and would have been binding on everybody.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—If no amendment had been tabled, this would have continued and would have been binding on all of us. Supposing this amendment is not accepted, what will be the result ? Instead of consulting the Government, the Director of Industries can himself appoint these officials for a period of one year. This amendment is an improvement on the original note. Therefore, I commend the amendment for the acceptance of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the following modifications made to the Mysore Public Service Commission Regulation (Limitation of Functions), 1953, by the Legislative Council be adopted:

1. In the annexure under Subordinate Service for the existing note, the following note shall be substituted :

'The Director of Industries and Commerce is authorised to appoint in consultation with the Government the following staff in the Ministerial cadre for a period not exceeding one year.'

2. In the annexure under Subordinate Service in line No. 5 after the words 'Bus Drivers', the words 'Conductors and Cleaners in Government Service' be added."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri G. A. Thimmappa Gowda need not move his amendment as it is covered already. So also, Sri Boranna Gowda need not move his amendment. There is an amendment by Sri Chickalingiah.

***Sri M. CHIKKALINGIAH** (Malavalli-Scheduled Castes).—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment :

"In Clause 4, after the proviso to the clause (*d*), the following proviso shall be added :

'Provided further that in the case of direct recruitment to all regular services the Commission shall be consulted in respect of the just and adequate proportion of such appointments in each cadre, class or category of services in regard to both the Schedule Castes and Schedule Tribes, such proportion being computed in relation to the population of such communities in the State'."

ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಲಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವು ಹೇಗೆ ಉಂಟಾಯಿತೆಂದರೆ ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾಸ್ಟಿನವರಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಟ್ರೈಬ್ಸಿನವರಿಗೂ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ, ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರು ಈ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುವಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಹತೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ಕಾರಣ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ದೊರೆಯುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. 1918ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯಿಂದಲೂ ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇನೋ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೆಲಕೆಲವು ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತರಗತಿಯ ಜನರಿಗಾಗಿ ಖಾಸಲಾಗಿಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರೂ, ಈ ಕೋಮಿನವರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ನೆಪದ ಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಖಾಸಲಾಗಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನು ಬೇರೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 30-35 ವರ್ಷ

(Sri M. CHIKKALINGIAH.)

ಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಮುಡುವಾಗಿಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಬಂದಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳಿವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಉತ್ತೇಜನದಿಂದಲೂ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರೀಗ ಎಚ್ಚೆತ್ತುಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೂ ಈಗ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಜನ ತಿಳಿವಳಿಕಸ್ಥರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳವರು ಬಹಳ ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ತೀರಾ ಹಿಂದುಳಿದವರಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಈ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಇತರ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿರುವ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ, ಸಾಮಾಜಿಕ ಮತ್ತು ನೈತಿಕ ಮುಂತಾದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳವರ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ನಾನಾ ಮುಖವಾಗಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ನೌಕರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆಹೋದರೆ ಅವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕಮಟ್ಟವು ಬಹಳ ಕೆಳಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚತಕ್ಕ ಕ್ರಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿರತಕ್ಕ ಉಮೇದುವಾರರಿಗೆ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗದ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಧಾರವಾಗಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಈ ನೌಕರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸಲು ನಾನೀಗ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಆದು ನಮ್ಮ ಆರ್ಕಾಸ್ಟ್ರಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಆದಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾಗ್ರತೆ ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದೂ, ತನ್ಮೂಲಕ ಇವರ ಆರ್ಥಿಕಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಾಗುವಂತೆಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದೂ ನಾನು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಪಡಿಸಲು ಈಗ ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸವೇನೋ ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಹರಿಜನರಿಗೆ ಸೇಕಡ 16ಕ್ಕೆರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಭರವಸೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದು, ಈ ನಿಮ್ನ ವರ್ಗದವರಿಗೆ ಅವರ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ, ಆರ್ಥಿಕಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಮೂಲಪ್ರಾಯವಾಗಿರುವಂಥ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಇವರಿಗೊಂದು ಸಹಾಯವನ್ನು ನೀಡಿ ಇವರನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಇತರ ಜನಾಂಗಗಳ ಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯತನಕ ಈ ಬಾಬಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಲುಕ್ಸಾನಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಸರಿಗಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇವರಿಗೊಂದು 'Weightage' ಅನ್ನು ಸಹ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಸರ್ವರೂ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ಪೀಮ್ಯ, ಈ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಸರ್ವೀಸ್ ರೂಲ್ಸುಗಳಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಪುಷ್ಟೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತ ನಾನು ಒಂದೆರಡು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಪೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಪಂಗಡಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾತಿನಿಧ್ಯ ಸಿಕ್ಕುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದೂ, ಈ ಹುದ್ದೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶೇಕಡ 17 ರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳು ದೊರೆಯಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶೇಕಡ 1ರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಈಗ ದೊರೆತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿನ್ನೆತಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯಸಚಿವರು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಶೇಕಡ 16ಕ್ಕೆರಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ನೌಕರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿಡಲಾಗುವುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇನೋ ಒಂದು ಶುಭಸೂಚನೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ನೌಕರಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆತರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯತನಕ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಜಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ದೊರಕಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಕೋಟ ಕೂಡ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ನೌಕರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೊರಕದೆ ಹೋದುದರಿಂದ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ದೇಶದ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಕೂಡ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂತು. ಇಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದೆರಡು ನಿದರ್ಶನಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವರ ಹೈಕಿ ಕೆಲವು ಇಂಜನಿಯರಿಂಗ್ ಗ್ರ್ಯಾಜುಯೇಟುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಸಿಕ್ಕದೆ ಅವರು ಹೊರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರು ಹಾಗೆ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿರಬಹುದು. ಅಂಥ ಒಬ್ಬಿಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯತನಕ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ದೊರೆಯದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ನಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಅನೇಕವೇಳೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯೊಳಗೇ ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—When you make that statement, you must substantiate it. So far as I am aware, no Depressed Class candidate has come forward with his application for appointment in Engineering Department excepting two who have been selected by the Public Service Commission.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಸಾಲದು. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ಅಪ್ಲಿಕೇಷನ್ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲದಿರಬಹುದು. ಪ್ರಮೋಷನ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—You are speaking of promotions of two persons and he is talking about the recruitment. There has been no unjust treatment on the part of the Public Service Commission; that is the point of the Minister.

In view of the very recent order, as the Minister said yesterday, wherein 16⅔ per cent is reserved, the matter ends there. There is no necessity for this amendment. Sri Chickkalingiah may withdraw this with the leave of the House for the time being. He may say, there are further things to be considered by Government and may leave the matter there. This is only my suggestion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.—ಹಾಗಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಕ್ವಾಲಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಇರುವವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅರ್ಹರಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದವರಿಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅಂಥ ಅವಕಾಶ ಬಿದ್ದಾಗ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇಟ್ಟಿರಬೇಕು. ಶೇಕಡ 16ಕ್ಕೆರಂತೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಈಗ ಶೇಕಡ ಆರರಷ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ

ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಉಳಿದ 10% ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸರಿಹೋಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ, ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಉತ್ತಮಗೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ವಿದ್ಯಾವಂತರಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಲಿ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಸರ್ವಿಸ್ಸೇ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಆಧಾರ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದಾಕ್ಷಣ್ಯ ತೋರಿಸದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಜನಾಂಗ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ವೈಚೇಜ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ನೂಕ್ಕ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Sir, if the Hon'ble Member who has tabled this amendment had known that the Government had fixed a percentage of appointments in the case of Depressed Class, I am sure, he would not have moved this amendment. In view of the Government Order which governs all cases of direct recruitment, this amendment is not relevant and not necessary. I assure the Hon'ble Member that the Government is always sympathetic towards the claims of the Depressed Class persons and continue to be so. In view of this assurance, I hope the Hon'ble Member will withdraw the amendment.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—What about weightage?

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—That is a diffe-rent matter altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Under clause 5, page 3, there is provision. That is under consideration of the Government.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಚಿಕ್ಕಲಿಂಗಯ್ಯ.—ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಷೆಡ್ಯೂಲ್ಡ್ ಕ್ಯಾಸ್ಟ್ಸ್ ಎಂದು ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not in order; do not raise it.

Sri M. CHIKKALINGIAH.—I beg leave to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—My doubt has not been cleared, Sir. So far as the report is concerned we are precluded from offering any remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is all over.

Sri Mulka GOVINDA REDDY (Chitaldrug).—We would like to discuss.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Only amendments or modifications.

MYSORE POLICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

AMENDMENTS MOVED IN THE COUNCIL

Motion to consider.

* **Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the amendments made to the Mysore Police (Amendment) Bill, 1953, by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration."

Sir, I think this is the first time that a Bill passed by this House has been sent back for the consideration of this House by an amendment by the Upper House. I think, Sir, now this House is seized of this Bill under Article 197 of the Constitution of India which governs the procedure when this Bill is sent with an amendment by the Legislative Council. With your permission, Sir, I beg to read Article 197. It reads as follows:

> "197 (1). If, after a Bill has been passed by the Legislative Assembly of a State having a Legislative Council and transmitted to the....."

Mr. SPEAKER.—No Hon'ble Member has so far raised any point of order. Why do you presume objection and go on?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I was reading that with reference to some other point. All right, I see the point.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sure objection will be raised. All right, you can go on. (*Laughter.*)

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I take the guidance from the Chair. Now, I shall confine myself, at this stage, to the relevant amendments made by the Upper House. Sir, as can be seen by the Hon'ble Members, in respect of clause 1, there is no change. Even with regard to Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 no change has been effected. It is only with regard to clause 2, Sir, amendments have been effected by the Upper House. Perhaps, it would be convenient if I read the relevant portions where the amendments have been effected by the Upper House